

FOR: Members, Tobacco Institute and TIRC
Condensed from Public Sources
by Hill and Knowlton, Inc.

TOBACCO NEWS SUMMARY
Nos. 72-74
February 27, 1959

NEWSPAPERS

72. Utah Tobacco Labeling Bill Ruled Unconstitutional. UPI Wire Story. February 26, 1959

Salt Lake City -- "A bill proposed in the Utah legislature to require a skull and crossbones insignia on all containers of tobacco was declared unconstitutional by the attorney general today.

"The bill, which has not been acted upon, would require also that the words 'contains poisonous ingredients' be marked on all tobacco containers sold in the state. (see TNS-66)

"Deputy Atty. Gen. Walter L. Budge ruled the bill was unconstitutional because Utah law does not specify that tobacco is poisonous.

"When in its wisdom the legislature determines that tobacco is in fact 'poisonous,' he said, 'then in the interest of public health and welfare traffic therein may be prohibited.'

73. Report Made on Tobacco Program. UPI Wire Story. February 27, 1959

"Informants said today a congressional subcommittee will give 'careful attention' to a report charging irregularities in government price support programs for tobacco in North Carolina and Tennessee.

"The charges were made in a report to the House Government Operations Committee by the Comptroller General's office, congressional watchdog on government spending.

"Auditors said they found such conditions as 'laxity' in administration, favoritism to relatives in increasing acreage allotments, improper transfers of allotments and poor handling of violation cases..

"Committee Chairman William L. Dawson (D-ILL.) referred the report over to a subcommittee headed by Rep. L. H. Fountain (D-N.C.)...."

MAGAZINES

74. PRINTERS' INK. February 20, 1959 (P.11). "Tobacco men retort to cancer-smoking report."

Reporting reactions to its last week's article on the READER'S DIGEST's "fresh attack on smoking as a cause of cancer" (see TNS-71), PRINTERS' INK refers to Tobacco Institute president James P. Richards' reply to the DIGEST article, and to the consequent statement by DIGEST managing editor, Alfred S. Dashiell.

To Mr. Richards question asking why the DIGEST failed to reprint a disclaimer (quoted by PI) carried with the original TODAY'S HEALTH article, Dashiell replied that the statement reached the DIGEST "weeks after the rest of the article was prepared," when the March issue was already on the press. On the question of the statement's appearance in a later issue of the domestic DIGEST, a DIGEST spokesman had no comment, PRINTERS' INK says.

1003543538